

Application No. 10/065,217
Docket No. 17MY-7239
Amendment dated September 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 26, 2006

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,810,467 to Wood et al. (Wood), claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,039,330 to Shaw, and claims 1-10 were provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,014,723 to Beck et al. (Beck). In response, Applicants have amended the claims as set forth above. More particularly:

Independent claim 1 has been amended to revert to the originally claimed ranges recited for Alloy A in Table VI, with the additional limitations that the minimum Al content is at least that reported for Alloy #6 in Table I, the maximum Al content is the upper limit reported for Alloy A in Table VI, the minimum Al+Ti is the lower limit reported for Alloy A in Table VI, and the maximum Al+Ti is that reported for Alloy #5 in Table I.

Dependent claims 2 and 3 have been amended for consistency with their parent claim 1.

Dependent claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 2 instead of claim 1, and to recite a limitation found in dependent claims 5 and 8.

Dependent claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 3 instead of claim 1.

Application No. 10/065,217
Docket No. 17MY-7239
Amendment dated September 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 26, 2006

Dependent claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 8 to provide antecedence for "the nozzle."

Independent claim 10, which recites ranges for Alloys #5-#7 in Table I, has been amended to have the additional limitations that the minimum Al content is at least that reported for Alloy #6 in Table I, the maximum Al content is the upper limit reported for Alloy A in Table VI, the minimum Al+Ti is the lower limit reported for Alloy A in Table VI, and the maximum Al+Ti is that reported for Alloy #5 in Table I.

Independent claim 11 has been amended to revert to the originally claimed ranges recited for Alloy B in Table VI, with the additional limitation that the maximum Al+Ti is that reported for Alloy #1 in Table I.

Dependent claims 12 and 13 have been amended for consistency with their parent claim 11.

Dependent claim 13 has been further amended to require the minimum Al content of that reported for Alloy #2 in Table I.

Dependent claim 17 has been amended to depend from claim 12 instead of claim 11, and to recite a limitation found in dependent claims 15 and 18.

Dependent claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 18 to provide antecedence for "the nozzle."